



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

is said of the evidence it furnishes of Warton's acquaintance with Sprat's well-known *History of the Royal Society* and other seventeenth-century antiquarian and historical disquisitions. Attention might at least be called to Warton's enthusiasm over contemporary interest in the past (*Life of Bathurst*, p. 150), to his praise of Bathurst for vindicating "antiquarian learning" (*op. cit.*, pp. 53 f.), and to the note in which he transcribes from one of the Aubrey manuscripts the famous traditions about Spenser's fellowship at Pembroke, Milton's whipping, and Shakespeare's being a butcher's son (*op. cit.*, pp. 153 f.).

To the influence of the Latin and Greek classics on Warton's English work Miss Rinaker gives scant attention (p. 138), and she disregards his considerable body of Latin verse, although it contains a number of passages illustrative of his fondness for the past.¹

TOM PEETE CROSS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Studies in the Syntax of the Lindisfarne Gospels. With Appendices on Some Idioms in the Germanic Languages. By MORGAN CALLAWAY, JR. Hesperia, Supplementary Series No. 5. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1918. Pp. xvi+240.

The title chosen by Professor Callaway indicates a broader field than that actually covered; the present work is merely the first instalment of proposed studies in the syntax of the Lindisfarne Gospels and is concerned only with the participle and the infinitive. The next instalment is to be devoted to the subjunctive mood. The present work is accordingly an extension into the Northumbrian dialect of Professor Callaway's syntactic researches upon the participle and the infinitive in West Saxon (*The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon*, 1889; *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon*, 1901; and *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, 1913) and is really supplementary to them. The principle object is to compare the syntax of these forms in Northumbrian with that of the same verbals in West Saxon, and both method of approach and classification and arrangement of material are similar to those of the earlier studies. Like the earlier studies, the present one is an extremely careful and detailed analysis: every form is recorded, the Latin correspondents are given whenever they are at all significant, forms unclassified by other investigators are assigned, every doubtful or unusual construction is annotated, and no difficulty is evaded. The consideration of each usage is followed by an explanation of the origin of the construction as native or foreign, not only in Northumbrian and Old English,

¹ Miss Rinaker's bibliography of Warton's works omits a new edition of *The Oxford Sausage* which appeared in 1777.

but also in the various Germanic languages. Not the least valuable part of the work is the independent evaluation of the evidence concerning the origins of various Germanic idioms presented in the numerous studies that have appeared since Professor Callaway's earlier publications, or that had escaped his attention in them. The list of works consulted includes some four hundred titles.

Professor Callaway's study incidentally throws into strong relief the incompetence of the *Lindisfarne* gloss as an English translation, particularly its close, frequently slavish, dependence upon and imitation of the Latin original. His method, however, usually discriminates native idioms from mere imitations of the original. If the glosser regularly renders a Latin turn of expression by a similar construction in Northumbrian, without any apparent effort at substitution, it may be inferred that the idiom employed is common to both languages. On the other hand, if he consistently tries to avoid a Latin idiom and to employ a different mode of expression, it is to be inferred that the substitute is a native idiom. These criteria and a comparison with corresponding usages in West Saxon and in the various Germanic dialects provide a basis for reasonably well-grounded conclusions.

This investigation shows that though the proportion of constructions closely based on the Latin—particularly certain uses of the infinitive with accusative subject—is considerably higher in *Lindisfarne* than in the West Saxon texts, yet in the main the dialect of *Lindisfarne* does not greatly differ from West Saxon in the use of the infinitive and the participle. This study also, practically without exception, confirms Professor Callaway in the views as to the origins of infinitive and participial constructions that he had arrived at in his studies in West Saxon. There are disclosed, however, a small number of constructions in *Lindisfarne* that are not found in West Saxon, though to call some of them "idioms," as is done in the Preface (p. iv), makes an impression as to normal and native usage to which one may take exception, and one which Professor Callaway destroys in his detailed consideration. In most cases these "idioms" are merely abject imitations of the Latin, sometimes even imitations of Latin expressions that the glosser had stupidly misunderstood. Of all five clear instances of the imperative infinitive (pp. 175-76), for example, one renders a Latin imperative infinitive, and the remaining four misrender Latin passive imperatives that have the same form as infinitives. Similarly, in every occurrence of the infinitive as object of a preposition (pp. 117-18), the *Lindisfarne* rendering merely follows the Latin slavishly, employing the uninflected infinitive to correspond to the Latin infinitive, and the inflected infinitive to correspond to the Latin gerundive.

Of the infinitive constructions not found in West Saxon, that most frequently occurring is what Professor Callaway terms the elliptical accusative with infinitive construction (pp. 180-95). It is made up of an accusative

substantive and a participle—usually present though not infrequently past; it renders a Latin accusative and gerundive without *esse*, or future participle without *esse*; and it depends usually upon verbs of commanding or declaring. To this mode of expression, which Professor Callaway rightly considers a “very close translation of the Latin original,” he finds interesting parallels as to both form and origin in some constructions of early Scandinavian dialects and in the High German gerund. A cross-reference suggests a comparison of this elliptical accusative and infinitive construction with the inflected infinitive and subject accusative. Such a comparison apparently shows that the glosser of Lindisfarne employed these two constructions indiscriminately in rendering the Latin gerundive and future participle. In translating a Latin accusative and future participle Lindisfarne has *cuoeða* (*ait*) and *foresæcga* (*pronuntiare*) followed by the inflected infinitive; and *forecuoeða* (*praedicere*), *foresæcga* (*prænuntiare*), and *soðsæcga* (*pronuntiare*) followed by the present participle. In translating a Latin accusative and gerundive Lindisfarne has *beada* (*praecipere*), *bebeada* (*praecipere*), *cuoeða* (*ait*, *dicere*), *forecuoeða* (*praedicere*), *foresæcga* (*praedicere*, *pronuntiare*), and *læra* (*docere*, *ammonere*) followed by the inflected infinitive; and *beada* (*commendare*), *cuoeða* (*ait*, *dicere*), *forecuoeða* (*praedicere*), *foresæcga* (*prænuntiare*), and *læra* (*docere*) followed by the present participle. Yet, though the inflected infinitive and the present participle are thus used apparently without distinction, there is indication of a preference. The inflected infinitive twice renders the Latin future participle and 32 times the gerundive; the present participle 8 times renders the Latin future participle and only 11 times the gerundive. Further (see pp. 123–24) the inflected predicative infinitive with “to be” denoting necessity or obligation, in 15 out of 21 occurrences renders the Latin gerundive, the remaining instances representing a variety of Latin constructions; and the inflected predicative infinitive with “to be” denoting futurity, though of not infrequent occurrence in the West Saxon Gospels, is not found in Lindisfarne (pp. 124–25)—the glosser usually employing the present participle.¹

It has been noted above that in Lindisfarne an inflected infinitive as object of a preposition occasionally renders the Latin gerundive as object of a preposition. It seems probable then that in the dialect of the glosser of Lindisfarne the idea of obligation or necessity as expressed in Latin by the gerundival periphrasis was expressed by the inflected infinitive with “to be,” but that, wooden translator as the glosser was, mere similarity in form induced him frequently to represent the Latin gerundive by the Old English present participle. To a mechanical word-by-word translator, too, the present participle was the nearest equivalent to the Latin future as well as

¹ For example, Matt. 11:3: “Tu es qui uenturus es?” is in the West Saxon Gospels, “Eart ðu ðe to cumenne eart?” and in Lindisfarne, “Arð ðu seðe to cymende wæs uel is?”

present participle, in the same way that the Old English present tense rendered both present and future tenses of Latin.¹

In his consideration of the absolute participle Professor Callaway finds two constructions that he did not find in West Saxon—the absolute nominative (10 examples) and the absolute accusative (21 examples). He regards the absolute nominative as not really an idiom but the result of a mixture of two constructions (p. 38), “the glossator wavering between a finite verb, which requires a nominative case, and an absolute participle, which requires an oblique case.” The absolute accusative he does consider a genuine Northumbrian idiom and regards it as one of several Northumbrian constructions in which accusative interchanges with dative, contrary to West Saxon usage (pp. 26–28). In most of the instances cited as accusative or nominative absolute, the substantive is unmistakable in case form, as it is either a pronoun, or a noun limited by a demonstrative or a definite article. A number of others, however, though Professor Callaway classifies them as absolute datives—probably regarding them as “crude”² or “weathered” forms—have no sign of case in either substantive or participle. Of the 30 past participles listed as absolute datives (pp. 7–10), at least 7 are thus indistinguishable from the nominative. The confusion in Lindisfarne of nominative, accusative, and dative in the absolute participial construction is paralleled by the confusion of these three case forms—particularly in the singular—in many other constructions, a confusion much wider than a mere interchange of accusative and dative. Professor Callaway quotes (p. 29) from Lindelöf’s *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Altnordhumbrischen* (Helsingfors, 1893) statements that in this Lindisfarne gloss the nominative and the accusative of feminine nouns had fallen together, and that there were traces of the coalescence of the dative with the nominative and accusative.³ Carpenter, *passim*, in *Die Deklination in der nordhumbrischen Evangelienübersetzung der Lindisfarner Handschrift* (Bonn, 1910), has shown in detail that confusion in nominative, accusative, and dative case forms, particularly in the singular, extended through nouns of all genders, adjectives, participles, and pronouns. If any inference as to idiom can be drawn from the case forms employed in the absolute participial construction in Lindisfarne, probably it is that the group of substantive plus participle was used without any distinct feeling for case, very much as it is in modern English.

The study as a whole is pleasingly free from the minor errors that usually obtrude themselves in a minute analysis. There are, of course, occasional

¹ In West Saxon the inflected infinitive with “to be” was the regular idiom for rendering both Latin periphrastic conjugations—with the future participle as well as with the gerundive (Callaway, *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, pp. 200–203).

² Professor Callaway’s use of “crude” as synonymous with “weathered” is altogether alien from that of Logemann, who first employed it (*Rule of St. Benet*, E.E.T.S., Orig. Series 90; Introduction V, § 3, p. xxxix), and of other students of Northumbrian, such as Lea and Carpenter.

³ The page reference to Lindelöf’s study is wrongly given as 299; it is 81.

lapses. *Druncniga* does not properly constitute an exception to the statement (pp. 102-3) that the objective infinitive that is active in form is active in sense, even though it renders a Latin passive (see *N.E.D.*, *drunken*, verb 1 and 2). *Awritta* in *were geneded ðæt awritta* (*cogereetur ut scriberet*) is not an infinitive (p. 169) but a preterite optative, as it is recorded in Cook's glossary. There is a slight inconsistency in recording the total number of present appositive participles as 168 in one paragraph and 167 in a paragraph immediately following (p. 61). The reference (p. 182) under *foresæga* to Mark, Introduction, 4, 14 is inexact. The compositor may well be responsible for a confusing "uninflected" which occurs twice for "inflected" in the description of the prepositional infinitive (p. 90). The work suffers very little, however, from typographical errors, the only others observed being "prseent" (p. 67), "serictly" (p. 137), and a semicolon for a comma on page 168. One may be sure that no work of Professor Callaway's will be marred by slovenliness.

W. F. BRYAN

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

The American Language. By H. L. MENCKEN. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1919. Pp. x+374.

This book is an attempt at a comprehensive account of the English language as spoken in America. Its earlier pages are largely devoted to two subjects on which the author apparently wishes to start a controversy: one, that American philologists despise the actual speech of their own country; the other, that the American speech is preferable to the English, its new words more effective ("more honest, more picturesque, more thoroughly Anglo-Saxon," etc.). He is able to maintain the first view chiefly by rather devious methods—emphasis on the expressed views of authorities whose interest was chiefly in rhetoric, and disparagement of the work of the Dialect Society and of the scholars who have investigated problems in American speech. He makes much of the fact that no comprehensive study of our language exists. The reason, of course, is that no philologist has felt himself equipped to handle so vast a subject, one which requires an exact knowledge of all the dialects spoken in this country and in England. In advancing the second opinion he quotes only notably vigorous or picturesque Americanisms and disregards effective Anglicisms (e.g., *slacker*, *Anzac*, *tank*). With these unfortunate preconceptions and his lack of philological training the author naturally has a distorted view of many things. He will not recognize dialects in this country (p. 19); apparently he always thinks of standard English as the only language of England but judges American speech by its colloquial forms; whenever sounds are involved he is likely to make extraordinary errors, e.g., "*G* disappears from the ends of words